

**Sullivan County Annual Convention  
June 28, 2005**

**Place: Claremont, New Hampshire  
Sugar River Valley Regional Technical Center  
(Aired Live and Taped)**

**Meeting Minutes**

**DELEGATION ATTENDEES:** John Cloutier – *Chair*, Larry Converse – *Vice Chair*, Arthur Jillette Jr. – *Clerk*, Brenda Ferland – *Executive Finance Committee (EFC) Chair*, Tom Donovan – *EFC Vice Chair*, Charlotte Houde-Quimby – *EFC*, Christopher Irish – *EFC*, Stephen G. Prichard – *EFC*, Peter Franklin, Harry S. Gale Jr., Joe Osgood, James Phinizy and Beverly Rodeschin.

**COUNTY ELECTED OFFICIALS, DEPARTMENT HEADS AND OTHER EMPLOYEES:**

Commissioners Donald S. Clarke – Chair, Bennie C. Nelson – Vice Chair, Ethel Jarvis – Clerk; County Manager – Ed Gil de Rubio; Nursing Home Administrator – Courtney Marshall; DOC Superintendent – Scott Hagar; Facilities & Operations Director – Greg Chanis; Human Services Coordinator – Sherrie Curtis; Conservation District Manager – Janice Heighes; Sullivan County UNH Cooperative Extension Co Office Manager – Seth Wilner; County Attorney – Marc Hathaway; County Treasurer – Mark Pitkin; High Sheriff – Michael Prozzo; Registrar of Deeds – Sharron King; DOC Secretary – Lori Blake; Accounts Payable/Account Clerk I – Dodi Violette; Commissioners Office Administrative Assistant – Sharon Johnson-Callum.

Other Public Attendees:

**9:03** Rep John Cloutier, Chairman, called the meeting to order.

Pledge to flag was led by County Commissioner Don Clarke.

Rep. Cloutier had all the delegation members introduce themselves. He then had the County Commissioners and department heads introduce themselves.

Commissioner Clarke then gave a report for the Commissioners. He started out by delivering news regarding the Pro-Share Funds that the County was expecting to receive from the State of NH. , in the amount of \$1,780,171. *He noted that he would be participating in a conference call to the NH Association of Counties this morning. We got a notice from the state Dept. of Health and Human Services last Friday, that they expected a return of \$1,772,110, leaving a Pro-Share balance to the County of about \$8,000. The Commissioner's budget was built on the assumption that we would be receiving the full amount of this Pro-Share money. The Commissioners and the executive committee met yesterday. On June 27<sup>th</sup> the Commissioners voted to recommend that the amount of money to be raised by taxes be raised from \$9,152,114 to 9,433,119, which is*

*the same amount as raised last year. The difference is \$281,005. Any additional shortfall would be taken from Capital Improvement sections of the budget.*

It is the intention of the County Commissioners to fight this tooth and nail. We feel that this request is a flagrant violation of the agreements made when the law was passed last year. There are also disagreements about billing. He read an email from Senator Odell confirming that the "bed tax" was intended entirely for the counties. *Comm. Clarke* referred to the action of the DHHS action to be a "flagrant sucker punch". *Comm. Clarke* will be talking with the NH Association of Counties at 10:00 A.M. today. (Refer to Appendix 1. FY-2005 Budget-Pro-share submitted by County Manager.)

Rep Phinzey "What was the rationale for this request?" *Comm. Clarke*: It appears that HHS feels we got a windfall we did not deserve.

Rep Gale: What will be our redress over this? *Comm. Clarke*: I am not sure if the redress will be legal or legislative. I recommend we put these monies aside in a fund until their final destination is figured out.

Rep. Franklin addressed a number of questions to *Comm. Clarke*. He questioned the dates of June 20<sup>th</sup> on the spreadsheet and why the delegates were not notified earlier. County Manager Ed Gil de Rubio gave a listing of the time lines for receipt of the Pro-Share information. *The spread- sheet was sent last Tuesday from the NHAC. He did not have an opportunity to study them until Wednesday afternoon. He called the Chair of the Finance Committee and the Commissioners on Thursday, and scheduled a meeting of the Commissioners and Finance Committee for Monday. He talked in a telephone conference call to DHHS on Friday. He did not get an accurate picture of the situation until 1:00 PM on Friday. A meeting was held on Monday Afternoon with the Commissioners and the Executive Finance Committee.* Rep. Franklin responded that it appeared that the County Manager had prior knowledge of the situation almost a week ago and was remiss in letting the Commissioners and the Delegation know about it until today. Rep. Franklin questioned the rightness in changing the significant amount of the budget at this late date. Mr. Gil de Rubio responded that it might have been a good move by the finance committee members in the room to give him a heads up on this proposed action. Rep Franklin responded that this information was not brought up to the Legislative Finance Committee and that he still feels that Mr. Gil de Rubio was remiss in not letting the Delegation and the Commissioners know about it earlier. Rep. Prichard spoke in support of the County staff and their efforts to put together a budget, and that he does not feel that they were trying to withhold information. Rep. Gale also spoke along the same lines.

Rep Chris Irish: Proposed that the Convention take a straw poll to see if we support the withholding of the funds until NH State HHS has a strong legal case for it being sent to them.

He made the following motion, following discussion and voted upon word change amendments:

- **That the Delegation vote to support and instruct the Commissioners to deposit the full Pro-Share amount to the bank account . Seconded by Rep. Prichard.**  
Discussion: Rep. Donovan: The enemy is not in this room. We have a HHS Commissioner that makes up unilateral rules that drastically change how business is conducted for counties and its' people. The enemy is in Concord. Rep. Prichard recommended that the other Counties be encouraged to follow the suit of Sullivan County, and withhold their Pro-Share Funds as well. Rep. Rodeschin: As a member of the Finance Division Three Committee, I was not aware that this was happening. Had I been aware, I would have been in contact with the County Commissioners, and my Division Chairman. Rep. Franklin is correct in that the County officials have known about this for a week and none of you have contacted me in advance! **Roll Call on motion: Ferland Y, Donovan Y, Quimby Y, Prichard Y, Irish Y, Jillette Y, Converse Y, Rodeschin AB, Phinzy Y, Gale Y, Osgood Y, Franklin Y, Cloutier Y. (12Y, 1 AB)**

Rep. Rodeschin: I have a meeting next Friday over at the NH State HHS in Concord and I would like the County office to supply me with complete written information to take with me.

Rep. Phinzey moved:

- **the Sullivan County Delegation ask the Governor to look into the management of the Department of Health and Human Services and that this delegation ask for the resignation of the Commissioner of Health and Human Services. Seconded by Rep. Houde-Quimby. Vote: Ferland Y, Donovan Y, Quimby Y, Prichard Y, Irish N, Jillette Y, Converse Y, Rodeschin N, Phinzy Y, Gale N, Osgood N, Franklin Y, Cloutier Y. (9Y, 4N)**

Following discussion it was stated by Commissioner Clarke that the Pro-Share funds would be held in an escrow account.

Mark Pitkin, County Treasurer, and Mark Hathaway, County Attorney, arrived and were introduced.

Rep. Franklin requested further details regarding the "errors in billing request" from NH State DHHS. Comm. Clarke explained that these were requests to balance out errors in billing for a variety of patients over the years 2003 and 2004. Rep. Franklin asked if these errors are made in other counties, and was assured that the other counties get similar bill corrections.

Rep. Irish asked that the meeting move forward to the business of the day.

Mr. Gil de Rubio thanked the Executive Finance Committee for six months of hard work under the leadership of Rep. Ferland.

Members of the public were offered an opportunity to speak. None appeared to comment.

Rep Ferland thanked the Executive Finance Committee for six months of hard work.

There are 27 Payrolls this fiscal year. *One Payroll* costs about \$320,000. Other budget increases are due to the following main factors. Health insurance 17% increase, Dental insurance 9% increase, Retirement 6.8% increase. *Most of the County employees received about 3% increase for salaries. The nursing home contract should be in the black. The Genesis Contract is \$200,000. The Long Term Coordinator position is no longer funded by the state, but will be funded by the County as a Marketing Position. We will also need to vote on mileage rates.*

She then presented the budget in accordance with the attached budget sheets.

Fund 22- Register of Deeds.

Rep Franklin: Were services transferred from the Registry of Deeds? Answer: Payroll accounting was transferred

Fund -24 Grants

Fund 10 – General Fund

Rep. Rodeschin asked about the County Forester. She asked why UNH is not picking up the cost of the County Forester? Mr. Wilner responded that they are only funding \$25,000 of the Forester salary in the future. Rep Rodeschin noted that she objects that UNH is dropping the full support of the County Forester. It was noted that the budget could be amended by the Delegation.

Rep. Rodeschin: Do the HCBC funds reflect the increases in the state budget? Answer: Yes. It was noted that these questions should wait till the end of this budget section presentation.

Questions:

Rep. Phinzy: Are the nurses at the DOC transferred back and forth from the Nursing Home? Answer: No they are full time. One half time nurse added.

Rep. Osgood – Under the Sheriffs Dept. asked for clarification. Sheriff: Have 6 FT people. 7 vehicles.

Rep. Osgood: What about the courthouse? Answer: \$118,972. Do the grantees give a report at the end of the year? Answer: Yes. Next year would appreciate an abbreviated report from each grantee next year.

Rep. Franklin: Can you break line two into the various sub-categories?

Of the *total*, \$ 9,433,119.00 will be raised from taxes. What are the capital funds? It is the capital reserve fund we set aside. \$223,500. Rep Franklin feels it is not a legal fund.

What is the surplus? *Rep. Ferland*: That is the money told to us by the auditors is surplus. The figure is about \$1,000,000 *according to Mr. Gil del Rubio*. Rep. Franklin does not see that the figures balance out. Mr. Gil de Rubio: The number should \$10,375,614. Rep. Franklin: I do not feel I got a detailed report as I requested. Rep Franklin: asked questions about retirement amounts. The County Commissioners set a salary figure of \$100,000 for the County Manager. Retirement is the same as other employees.

Rep Franklin: Is there a policy on the use and maintenance of County Vehicles? Is the county vehicle for personal or official use? Answer: Official.

Rep. Franklin: Were any emergency funds spent this year? Gil de Rubio: Paid for new furnaces. Rep. Franklin: Question about half time position becoming full time.

Rep Franklin: On page 4 PNMI is that for children only? Answer: Yes. Is that all the expense on the Woodhull budget? Answer: Only operating budget. Rep Franklin: What

about transfer from operation *of plant and* human resources? Why the transfer from one fund to the other? Mr. Gil de Rubio: we are doing the transfer on the advice of auditors as these services are conducted county wide. Rep Phinzy why did these transfers not come before us in the past? They were transfers in the same budget class in the past. Rep Rodeschin: You are creating a new fund at the direction of the auditors? Answer: Yes.

Are you really creating a slush fund? Answer: No. Rep. Ferland: *We are creating a new fund 30 that will handle human resources expenditures outside of the nursing home.*

(Refer to Appendix 2 – Sullivan County Budget Report – 2006 by Brenda Ferland.) Rep. Franklin: I asked *the County Manager* for a report of all intra and within budget transfers for the current budget year and did not receive that.

*Chair called a five-minute break.*

Rep Irish: I feel that Rep. Ferland should be allowed to continue to read off the budget as she has presented it to us. After she is finished, **I am going to move that the bottom line be accepted. And we then have discussion and possible amendments to this bottom line.** We have no right to change the line items of the budget. **I move that we limit debate to the bottom line of this budget and we move forward to the reading of this budget. Rep. Prichard and Gale: I second this motion.**

Rep Phinzy – are we voting on three motions or one. Rep. Converse: If we vote on the bottom line then the manager can move funds around as he pleases. I would vote no on this motion. Rep. Irish: The only thing we have a right to vote on is the bottom line! Rep. Rodeschin: We have the right to look at and amend the line item of this budget and arrive at a bottom line which we then vote upon. Rep. Franklin: I believe that Rep. Irish is completely mistaken about the role of the County Convention. Where does RSA 24 limit the right of the County Convention? He cited Daniels v. Hansen where the court states that the county convention sets all aspects of the budget. Rep Ferland: Can we get to the motion that will allow me to finish this budget presentation? [ The previous motion was never acted upon]

Rep Cloutier: What is the motion?

**Rep. Jillette: To allow Rep Ferland to complete the budget presentation without questions or interruption. Vote: Ferland Y, Donovan Y, Quimby Y, Prichard Y, Irish Y, Jillette Y, Converse Y, Rodeschin Y, Phinzy Y, Gale Y, Osgood Y, Franklin N, Cloutier Y. (12Y, 1N)**

Rep. Gale – Can the county attorney tell us if we can vote on line items in the budget or only the bottom line?

Rep Ferland continues:

Fund 30. (See written budget) *This is a new fund* \$1,243,474 total

Fund 40 (Nursing Home) (See Written budget) \$11,235,090.

Fund 42 Capital Improvements (See Written Budget) \$1,254,445 (*From written budget*).

*The bottom line of the budget is: \$23,929,020 of which \$9,433,119 is to be raised by property taxes.*

**Rep Irish Moved to accept a FY 06 budget of \$23,929,020 of which \$9,433,119 is raised by property tax. Rep Gale seconded.** *The motion was amended to a figure of \$24,210,025.* Rep. Irish moved to allow a debate only on the bottom line. Rep Gale: Repeated his question about the bottom line vs. line items. The county attorney said the convention had the authority to consider line items as they built the budget. Rep.

Rodeschin: We are the legislative body to approve or disapprove of this budget. Rep.

Phinzey: I feel that there are individual items in the budget I must get explained or else I will feel constrained to have them removed from the budget. There was further general discussion of the process of voting on the budget. Rep. Prichard gave the opinion that we should postpone the vote. Rep. Ferland spoke in favor of moving to a vote on the budget. Rep. Donovan: I feel we have a right to ask questions, and we should not vote to limit debate.

Rep. Franklin: I have attempted to get answers from the county in the past and have not received them. Rep. Irish: I feel that the chair needs to make a ruling on how we shall move forward with this motion. If people want to say negative things about County employees, they should be ruled out of order. Rep. Cloutier: I rule that we move forward with this motion with the understanding that the bottom line of the budget may be amended during the debate. If concerns are raised about County employees, then I will give them a chance to respond. Rep. Ferland: I would propose we agree to keep questions to a total of *15 minutes to explain all budget line items in total.* Rep. Cloutier – we will move forward with that understanding.

Rep. Phinzy asked for an explanation of the marketing budget items. Rep. Ferland:

There are two full time people. One will seek clients at hospitals etc. The other person will evaluate potential clients. These positions are both transfers from other departments.

Rep Franklin: Can we have a copy of the separate report about fund transfers? Answer:

You have been sent multiple copies of this report. Rep. Franklin: At best the report cannot be understood. Are the intergovernmental totals for fund 30 to be raised by taxes?

Rep Phinzy: This is a bookkeeping transfer? YES. Rep Converse: Do we budget for Per Diem Nurses. Mr. Gil de Rubio: There is \$200K in the budget for Per Diem nurses.

Rep. Phinzey: How many nurses are on the staff? Do we really have all employed? Mr.

Courtney Marshall: We have 3 or 4 unfilled positions. Rep. Rodeschin: How many beds are being put aside for respite care? Is Patty involved? Yes. Rep. Donovan: we are describing a capability to take in clients. Comm. Jarvis: The June 24 report says we have 2.70 vacant RNs, LPN 9.7 vacant, LNA's 2.40 vacant, 9.2 vacant LNA trainees.

**Rep Rodeschin moved to:**

- *Reduce the bottom line from \$24,210,025 to \$24,208,625, by reducing the delegation budget by \$1,400 to allow only one person to go to the County Convention at the Balsams. Amendment was defeated by voice vote.*

**Rep Donovan moved to:**

- **Reduce the budget by \$200,000, the amount of the Genesis contract for the next year. The actual figure leaves in funds for budget adjustments and training to keep the home operating as an independent entity.** Representative Prichard spoke that he felt this move was premature. I feel that this move will undermine the whole budget process. Rep. Irish: I feel we need to give this process more time, and then decide at a later date if we want to “fire” them. Rep. Rodeschin: I am in favor of keeping the contract for a year. In case you forget, we had a deficit caused by the County Nursing Home for the two years prior to Genesis coming here. I only received one call about the changes at the Nursing Home, and I hope I took care of her concern. Rep. Donovan you said we lost 10 employees. I believe that many of them had an opportunity for further education. I would appreciate your further explanation regarding these employees. Rep. Donovan: The additional 6 months of the contract will complete a year. I feel we have extremely well qualified people working at the Home. If the only issue is Medicaid and money enhancement I think we have the people to do that. Rep. Converse: I note that there has been 24 beds unfilled this past year. If you look around the home you will see problems. Rep. Donovan: I don’t feel we need to extend the contract beyond the next six months. Rep. Gale: I am against this amendment. I feel that this is a good way to do business. I feel Genesis is entitled to a reasonable time to show they can solve problems. Rep. Osgood: Genesis is attempting to change bad habits. I am against this motion. Rep. Houde-Quimby: Genesis took this contract to show how they could perform in other County Homes. We still have 10 agency shifts per week. I support Tom’s motion because I think he is on the right track. Rep. Phinzey: I feel that with the funds we pay the manager I feel that I support Tom’s motion. Rep. Donovan: Yes the ten aides laid off were offered the training, but many of them are age 60 or older and could not complete the training. I think we owed these people more than that. Rep. Irish: I feel that these people will do us good. I don’t see the downside.

**Question Called.**

**Donavan moves to:**

- **Reduce the budget to \$24,930,025 in order to delete the contract with Genesis by December 30<sup>th</sup>. This includes leaving in the budget \$10,000 for the Nursing Home Administrator and \$10,000 for training and other activities. Vote:**  
**Ferland N, Donovan Y, Quimby Y, Prichard N, Irish N, Jillette Y, Converse Y, Rodeschin N, Phinzy Y, Gale N, Osgood N, Franklin Y, Cloutier Y. (7Y, 6N)**

Mr. Gil de Rubio: I am not in any condition to propose an alternative budget today. Some discussion about possible alternative meeting date.

**Rep. Houde-Quimby proposed a reconsideration of the vote.**

Mr. Gil de Rubio: I will call Genesis tomorrow and tell Genesis to hit the road. Rep. Ferland: They will walk in 90 Days. Comm. Clarke: I do not feel this gives Genesis a fair shake. Rep. Rodeschin – at the public hearing they said they would include the delegation in the negotiations with Genesis. Rep. Franklin: a one-year trial is sufficient. Rep. Gale: The current contract goes until Dec. 30 and have you made a prior arrangement with Genesis to continue until June 30<sup>th</sup>? Comm. Clarke: They have offered to continue until June 30<sup>th</sup>. So our new contract would be coexistent with our fiscal year. Rep. Prichard: We cannot do this to these people. We are undermining their authority. Rep. Irish: This move will have a tax impact. Rep. Gale: argued to allow the contract to work out through next June.

- **Question Call in favor by voice vote.**
- **Question of Reconsideration moved to vote. Vote: Ferland Y, Donovan N, Quimby Y, Prichard Y, Irish Y, Jillette Y, Converse N, Rodeschin Y, Phinzy N, Gale Y, Osgood Y, Franklin N, Cloutier Y. (9Y, 4N). Reconsideration Passed.**
- **Vote on Donovan's motion. Vote: Ferland N, Donovan Y, Quimby N, Prichard N, Irish N, Jillette N, Converse Y, Rodeschin N, Phinzy Y, Gale N, Osgood N, Franklin Y, Cloutier N. (4Y, 9N)**
- **Rep. Gale: Attempted to form a motion that would require the commissioners to come back to the delegation before signing a new contract. Seconded by Rep. Rodeschin. Rep. Prichard: I feel that the commissioners have the authority and responsibility to make a new contract on their own volition. We should be asking them to include the delegation in any contract negotiations with Genesis. Mr. Gil de Rubio: The delegation WILL BE INVITED to be part of the negotiation process. Gale and Rodeschin withdrew their motion.**
- **Rep. Osgood seconded by Rep. Irish to call the question on the original budget vote. Roll Call Vote: Ferland Y, Donovan Y, Quimby Y, Prichard N, Irish Y, Jillette Y, Converse Y, Rodeschin Y, Phinzy N, Gale Y, Osgood Y, Franklin N, Cloutier Y. (10Y, 3N)**
- **Budget Vote: Budget bottom line of \$24,210,025 and to raise \$ 9,433,119 in taxes for FY 06. Roll Call Vote: Ferland Y, Donovan N, Quimby N, Prichard N, Irish Y, Jillette N, Converse N, Rodeschin Y, Phinzy N, Gale Y, Osgood Y, Franklin N, Cloutier Y. (6Y, 7N) Budget Failed.**

Rep. Ferland it does not do us any good to delay. Rep. Rodeschin do we need a continuing resolution? Comm. Clark: on Pro-Share we may know the answers sooner or later. The commissioners agreed that if the budget were raised as we set it up we would live with it and delay Capital expenditures if we needed to live without the Pro-Share Funds.



**On the basis of that statement Rep. Prichard moved:**

- **For reconsideration of the previous vote. Rep. Houde-Quimby: My vote represents lack of trust at the state level. Rep. Phinzy: I will change my vote but I don't believe you will meet those projected revenues. Comm. Clark: I am hopeful we will meet the Genesis projections. Rep. Franklin: This budget will be better known after more information is known. Voice vote to call the question. Roll call vote reconsideration of previous vote. Vote: Ferland Y, Donovan N, Quimby Y, Prichard Y, Irish Y, Jillette Y, Converse N, Rodeschin Y, Phinzy Y, Gale N, Osgood Y, Franklin N, Cloutier Y. (9Y, 4N)**
- **Back to original Budget vote. Budget bottom Line of \$24,210,025 and to raise \$9,433,119 in property taxes. Vote: Ferland Y, Donovan N, Quimby Y, Prichard Y, Irish Y, Jillette Y, Converse N, Rodeschin Y, Phinzy Y, Gale N, Osgood Y, Franklin N, Cloutier Y. (9Y, 4N)**

**Rep. Ferland moved:**

- **To reconsider the previous vote. Vote: Ferland N, Donovan Y, Quimby N, Prichard N, Irish N, Jillette N, Converse Y, Rodeschin N, Phinzy N, Gale N, Osgood N, Franklin Y, Cloutier N. (3Y, 10N)**

*Meeting then took a half hour break for lunch.*

**Rep. Phinzey made a motion to:**

- **Raise mileage rate to .40 cents per mile. Seconded by Rodeschin. Vote: Jillette Y, Converse N, Rodeschin Y, Phinzy Y, Osgood Y, Franklin Y, Cloutier Y. (6Y, 1N)**

*Reps. Gale, Quimby and Prichard arrived.*

**Motion to:**

- **Authorize the County Commissioners to apply for, receive and expend federal and state grants which become available during the course of the year, and also to accept and expend money from any other governmental unit or private source to be used for purposes for which the county may legally appropriate money. Motion by Rep. Phinzey and Seconded by Rep. Osgood. Rep. Franklin said that this should be monitored carefully. Vote: Jillette Y, Converse Y, Rodeschin Y, Phinzy Y, Osgood Y, Franklin N, Cloutier Y. Quimby Y, Gale Y, Prichard Y (9Y, 1N)**

**Rep. Phinzey moved and Rep. Franklin seconded the following motion:**

- **That the County Commissioners get approval of the Executive Finance Committee before transferring funds in accordance with RSA 24:15.**

**Rep. Rodeschin moved and Rep. Prichard seconded the following amendment to the previous vote:**

- **The County Convention requires that the County Commissioners obtain written authority of the executive Committee before transferring monies from one fund to another fund or any appropriation or part thereof under RSA 24:15.** There was a discussion of inter and intra department transfers and the authority of the Commissioners. Rep. Franklin points out Fund 42 that could require intrafund transfers, as it contains more than a million dollars in funds. Question called and passed on a voice vote. **Vote on the Rodeschin- Prichard Amendment. Vote was 8-2 in Favor. Osgood Y, Phinzey Y, Franklin N, Rodeschin Y, Cloutier Y, Converse N, Quimby Y, Prichard Y, Gale Y, Jillette Y.**
- **Vote on the amended motion. Vote was 8-2 in Favor. Osgood Y, Phinzey Y, Franklin N, Rodeschin Y, Cloutier Y, Converse N, Quimby Y, Prichard Y, Gale Y, Jillette Y.**

Rep. Gale asked the Delegation to vote to hold a couple of hearings about the inequities in the manner in how the towns in the Counties are funded. He is concerned about the possibility of succession of Sunapee from the County. Rep. Prichard felt that Sunapee should fund a study to look at the costs and benefits of succession. It was agreed that we would support a couple of meetings perhaps in Newport and Claremont.

The Convention then discussed request from the NH VT Solid Waste Project regarding Rep. Franklin's behavior at the project meetings. Rep. Franklin has asserted his right to participate in the NH District meetings, both public and private to fully participate. Their lawyer feels that the agreement only allows him to participate in JOINT MEETINGS. The state districts only include town representatives. They are not asking the delegation to take action today. They may be back to us later regarding this. Rep. Franklin spoke in his own defense.

**4:14 Rep Rodeschin moved to adjourn the meeting.**

*Respectfully submitted:*



*Arthur Jillette, Clerk  
Sullivan County Delegation*